UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,738	09/30/2003	Tony T. Quach	66329/31274	6724

23380   7590   10/16/2008

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 HUNTINGTON BUILDING
925 EUCLID AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OH 44115-1414

EXAMINER
HANG, VU B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/16/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@tuckerellis.com
christopher.luoma@tuckerellis.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/674,738	QUACH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vu B. Hang	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 June 2008*.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,13-16,18-20 and 28-30* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,13-16,18-20 and 28-30* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 September 2003* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *09/30/2003*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

- This office action is responsive to the communication filed on 06/23/2008.

- The amendments received on 06/23/2008 have been entered and made of record.

- Claims 1, 3-5, 13-16, 18-20 and 28-30 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed on 06/23/2008, with respect to the amended independent

claims and the cited prior art, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the

rejections of Claims 1, 3-5, 13-16, 18-20 and 28-30 have been withdrawn. However, upon

further consideration, new grounds of rejection are made in view of Kurumida (US Pub.

2004/0145760 A1), Kavathekar et al. (US Patent 5,572,631) and Oomura et al. (US Patent

7,319,532 B2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 3-5, 16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Kurumida (US Pub. 2004/0145760 A1) in view of Kavathekar et al. (US Patent 5,572,631),

and in further view of Oomura et al. (US Patent 7,319,532 B2).

4. Regarding **Claims 1 and 16**, Kurumida discloses a method to manage multiple format fonts in a document processing device controller of an image generating device (see Fig.2 (S202,S203,S204), Fig.5, paragraph [0006] an paragraph [0015]), comprising the steps of: receiving a management request from an associated user via an associated network to store a font in a selected storage area of an image generating device (see Fig.1 (2,21,4,42), Fig.2 (S201,S203), Fig.5, paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0034]); receiving, from the workstation non-bitmapped font data corresponding to a received management request (see Fig.2 (S203,S210), Fig.5 and paragraphs [0034-0035]); selectively generating a new non-bitmapped font file (see Fig.2 (S210) and paragraph [0035]); testing the font specification data in accordance with the font file data stored (see Fig.1 (4,42) and paragraphs [0026-0027]); retrieving the font data file from the associated storage in accordance with the step of testing (see Fig.1 (4,42) and paragraphs [0026-0027]) and commencing a rendering operation of an electronic document data in conjunction with the font data file (see Fig.1 (4,42) and paragraphs [0026-0027]). Kurimuda fails to expressly disclose selectively generating a new font file such that when it is determined that the font to be stored is of specific type, pre-appending a selected language code to the font data to create a new font data file inclusive of the font data code portion and the language code portion; returning an error message to the user when an unsupported font is to be stored; rasterizing and storing the font file; and transferring the document data into a spooler disposed on the image generating device.

5. Kurumida, however, teaches that font data needs to be converted into a format that is compatible with the printer language of the selected printer (see Fig.2 (S206,S209), paragraph [0012] and paragraph [0039]); and assigning to the font data file a coding scheme for converting

the font data into a format supported by the printer language of the selected printer (see Fig.2

(S206,S209), Fig.5, paragraph [0031] and paragraph [0035]). Kurumida also teaches determining

whether a coding scheme for a corresponding font data file is supported by the printer language

of the selected printer (see Fig.2 (S205), paragraph [0012], paragraph [0014] and paragraph

[0033]). Kavathekar a printer interface that supports a plurality of printer languages (see Fig.1

(101,102,103,104) and Col.2, Line 34-51), wherein the font data is rasterized for rendering in

accordance with the selected printer language (see Fig.1 (106,107,109), Col.4, Line 55 – Col.5,

Line 5 and Col.6, Line 10-17). Oomura teaches using a spooler for rendering documents data,

received from an application, and the font data used for the document processing (see Fig.2

(2,13,18), Fig.3 (201,204) and Col.16, Line 57 – Col.17, Line 21).

6.   Kurumida, Kavathekar and Oomura are combinable because they are from the same field

of endeavor, namely print data processing systems. At the time of the invention, it would have

been obvious for one skilled in the art to include Kurumida's method the step for selectively

generating a new font file such that when it is determined that the font to be stored is of specific

type, pre-appending a selected language code to the font data to create a new font data file

inclusive of the font data code portion and the language code portion. The motivation would be

to include a format conversion instruction (coding scheme) to the font data file for converting the

font data into a format supported by the selected printer. This would enable for the font data of a

printer language format to be converted and printed at a printer supported by a different printer

language. It is also obvious for one skilled in the art to include a means for returning an error

message when a user attempts to store an unsupported font. The motivation would be to inform

the user from a workstation that the image generating device does not support fonts in a specific

printer language format. It is further obvious for one skilled in the art to include a means for

rasterizing and storing the font file at the image generating device; and transferring the document

data into a spooler disposed on the image generating device. The motivation would be to render

the document data with the font data for printing. Without the print data being rasterized, stored

and rendered, the print data (the document data with font data) cannot be printed.

7.   Regarding **Claims 3 and 18**, Kevathekar further teaches storing the rendered document

in the selected storage area (see Fig.1 (101,102,103,106,109), Col.4, Line 49 – Col.5, Line 5 and

Col.5, Line 14-20).

8.   Regarding **Claims 4 and 19**, Kurumida, Kavathekar and Oomura teach the method of

Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose that the management request is received via simple manage

network protocol or a web administration user interface. Kurumida, however, teaches

communication between a host computer and a network of printers (see Fig.1, Fig.2 (S201) and

paragraph [0032]). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the

art to include the use of simple manage network protocol or a web administration user interface

for communicating the management request from a remote computer to the image generating

devices. The motivation would be to set up a network interface for communication in a network

environment.

9.   Regarding **Claims 5 and 20**, Kurumida, Kavathekar and Oomura teach the method of

Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose that the image generating device is selected from a group

consisting of a printing device, facsimile device, a copying device and a video display device.

Kurumida, however, teaches that the font format conversion method can be applied with a

printing device, a copier, a facsimile device and computer interface devices (see Fig.1 and

paragraph [0057]). At the item of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to select from a printing device, facsimile device, a copying device and a video display device, as they are image forming devices. The motivation would be to give the user multiple image forming devices to select from for displaying the image data. It is also known in the art that multifunction peripheral devices can include a copying device, a facsimile device, a display device and a printing device, from which a user can select for operation.

10.   Claims 13-15 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurumida (US Pub. 2004/0145760 A1) in view of Kavathekar et al. (US Patent 5,572,631), and in further view of Oomura et al. (US Patent 7,319,532 B2), and in further view of McQueen et al. (US Patent 5,586,242).

11.   Regarding **Claims 13 and 28**, Kurumida discloses a method to manage multiple format fonts in a document processing device controller of an image generating device (see Fig.2 (S202,S203,S204), Fig.5, paragraph [0006] an paragraph [0015]), comprising the steps of: receiving a management request from an associated user via an associated network to store a font in a selected storage area of an image generating device (see Fig.1 (2,21,4,42), Fig.2 (S201,S203), Fig.5, paragraph [0011] and paragraph [0034]); receiving, from the workstation non-bitmapped font data corresponding to a received management request (see Fig.2 (S203,S210), Fig.5 and paragraphs [0034-0035]); selectively generating a new non-bitmapped font file (see Fig.2 (S210) and paragraph [0035]); testing the font specification data in accordance with the font file data stored (see Fig.1 (4,42) and paragraphs [0026-0027]); retrieving the font data file from the associated storage in accordance with the step of testing (see Fig.1 (4,42) and paragraphs [0026-0027]) and commencing a rendering operation of an

electronic document data in conjunction with the font data file (see Fig.1 (4,42) and paragraphs

[0026-0027]). Kurimuda fails to expressly disclose selectively generating a new font file such

that when it is determined that the font to be stored is of specific type, pre-appending a selected

language code to the font data to create a new font data file inclusive of the font data code

portion and the language code portion; returning an error message to the user when an

unsupported font is to be stored; rasterizing and storing the font file; and transferring the

document data into a spooler disposed on the image generating device.

12.   Kurumida, however, teaches that font data needs to be converted into a format that is

compatible with the printer language of the selected printer (see Fig.2 (S206,S209), paragraph

[0012] and paragraph [0039]); and assigning to the font data file a coding scheme for converting

the font data into a format supported by the printer language of the selected printer (see Fig.2

(S206,S209), Fig.5, paragraph [0031] and paragraph [0035]). Kurumida also teaches determining

whether a coding scheme for a corresponding font data file is supported by the printer language

of the selected printer (see Fig.2 (S205), paragraph [0012], paragraph [0014] and paragraph

[0033]). Kavathekar a printer interface that supports a plurality of printer languages (see Fig.1

(101,102,103,104) and Col.2, Line 34-51), wherein the font data is rasterized for rendering in

accordance with the selected printer language (see Fig.1 (106,107,109), Col.4, Line 55 – Col.5,

Line 5 and Col.6, Line 10-17). Oomura teaches using a spooler for rendering documents data,

received from an application, and the font data used for the document processing (see Fig.2

(2,13,18), Fig.3 (201,204) and Col.16, Line 57 – Col.17, Line 21).

13.   Kurumida also fails to disclose a step for receiving a management request from the user

to remove a selected font from the storage area, creating a new file that includes a selected

command and the font to be removed, and upon determination that the selected font is stored in

the storage area, removing the selected font from the storage area; generating a list of fonts

corresponding to the selected type of fonts; transmitting the list of fonts to the associated user via

the display means; and generating test documents listing the fonts. McQueen, however, discloses

receiving a management request from an associated user to remove a selected font from

a storage area (see Fig.7 (130) and Col.9, Line 1-14); creating a new file that includes a selected

command and the font to be removed (see Col.9, Line 1-14); and removing the selected font

from the storage area (see Fig.7 (138) and Col.9, Line 15-23). McQueen further teaches that

storing too many fonts and de-installing could be time-consuming (see Col.9, line 45-55).

McQueen also discloses generating a list of fonts corresponding to the selected type of font (see

Fig.9, Col.4, Line 57-60 and Col.9, Line 1-27); and transmitting the list of fonts to the associated

user via the display means (see Fig.9 and Col.4, Line 57-60); and generating test documents

listing the fonts (see Fig.9 and Col.10, Line 40-65).

14.   Kurumida, Kavathekar, Oomura and McQueen are combinable because they are from the

same field of endeavor, namely print data processing systems. At the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include Kurumida's method the step for

selectively generating a new font file such that when it is determined that the font to be stored is

of specific type, pre-appending a selected language code to the font data to create a new font data

file inclusive of the font data code portion and the language code portion. The motivation would

be to include a format conversion instruction (coding scheme) to the font data file for converting

the font data into a format supported by the selected printer. This would enable for the font data

of a printer language format to be converted and printed at a printer supported by a different

printer language. It is also obvious for one skilled in the art to include a means for returning an

error message when a user attempts to store an unsupported font. The motivation would be to

inform the user from a workstation that the image generating device does not support fonts in a

specific printer language format. It is further obvious for one skilled in the art to include a means

for rasterizing and storing the font file at the image generating device; and transferring the

document data into a spooler disposed on the image generating device. The motivation would be

to render the document data with the font data for printing. Without the print data being

rasterized, stored and rendered, the print data (the document data with font data) cannot be

printed.

15.   It is further obvious to include to the steps of receiving a management request from an

associated user to remove a selected font from a storage area; creating a new file at includes a

selected command and the font to be removed; and upon determination that the selected font is

stored in the storage area, removing the selected font from the storage area. The motivation

would be to remove excess fonts that are not needed and to avoid the time-consuming process of

de-installing the fonts. Creating the file with the fonts to be removed would allow a user to avoid

the process of de-installing the fonts. It is also obvious to include the steps of generating a list of

fonts to the associated user by display means; and generating test documents listing the fonts.

The motivation would be to provide a user interface for creating and displaying the font lists.

The user interface would allow for the selected font description data to be viewed on the display

and then be used on the intended documents.

16.   Regarding **Claims 14 and 29**, Kurumida, Kavathekar, Oomura and McQueen teach the

method of Claim 13 but fail to expressly disclose that the management request is received via

simple manage network protocol or a web administration user interface. Kurumida, however, teaches communication between a host computer and a network of printers (see Fig.1, Fig.2 (S201) and paragraph [0032]). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to include the use of simple manage network protocol or a web administration user interface for communicating the management request from a remote computer to the image generating devices. The motivation would be to set up a network interface for communication in a network environment.

17.   Regarding **Claims 15 and 30**, Kurumida, Kavathekar, Oomura and McQueen teach the method of Claim 1 but fail to expressly disclose that the image generating device is selected from a group consisting of a printing device, facsimile device, a copying device and a video display device. Kurumida, however, teaches that the font format conversion method can be applied with a printing device, a copier, a facsimile device and computer interface devices (see Fig.1 and paragraph [0057]). At the item of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to select from a printing device, facsimile device, a copying device and a video display device, as they are image forming devices. The motivation would be to give the user multiple image forming devices to select from for displaying the image data. It is also known in the art that multifunction peripheral devices can include a copying device, a facsimile device, a display device and a printing device, from which a user can select for operation.

Conclusion

18.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

19.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

20.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Vu B. Hang whose telephone number is (571)272-0582. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00am - 6:00pm.

21.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

22.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Vu B. Hang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625